

He acted. He picked up his flame-thrower, and he ran towards those trying to take him out; and he did it again and again and again. He did so because he believed in something greater than himself, because his country asked him, and he answered. He was there in that place and at that time when his country—our country—needed him the most.

Woody is the last surviving Medal of Honor recipient from the Battle of Iwo Jima, and he is celebrating his 93rd birthday on October 2. I join my State and a grateful Nation in thanking Woody Williams for his service and in wishing him a wonderful birthday.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to another bad trade deal that could soon be forced upon us. It is possible that the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, could be brought before this body for a final vote before the end of the year and end of this Congress.

We have seen time and again what bad trade deals do to our communities and to working families across this Nation. You see, when NAFTA was under consideration, American workers were told that the trade benefits would mean more jobs and economic opportunities.

What actually happened? We saw a net loss of 700,000 jobs thanks to NAFTA. So if history is any guide, we know what to expect from TPP. But in many ways, this agreement is even more harmful than NAFTA. In fact, the core of this deal is allowing foreign corporations to sue the U.S. Government over regulations they simply do not like.

□ 1045

Imagine, any time there is an environmental regulation or worker safety regulation that a company does not care for, they can sue.

These cases will not go through the regular legal process. Instead, TPP creates a special tribunal of three corporate lawyers to evaluate the case. And if a company convinces these three lawyers that a law or regulation violates their TPP rights, well, then the American taxpayer has to pay these corporations enormous compensation.

Let's be clear. There is no appeal process. There is no way to reverse these decisions. The TPP could put the taxpayer on the hook for almost unlimited sums of money.

It is no wonder that this agreement was negotiated in private. While corporations were given plenty of opportunity to comment on how they wanted the agreement to look, the public and workers were not given a seat in the room—or even the chance to review the text before it was finalized.

The end result, unsurprisingly, is an agreement that is bad for the American people and would affect their daily lives in countless ways. American workers would find themselves competing for jobs against workers in places like Vietnam, who make 65 cents an hour—65 cents an hour.

It is no wonder that this agreement would require the U.S. to import food that does not meet our own safety standards. It would mean more expensive prescription drugs for our seniors, and it would curtail policies meant to fight climate change.

Mr. Speaker, the TPP is 6,000 pages long. It is too big and covers too much. It has too many unintended consequences. There should be no rush to push this agreement through the House before the end of the year.

However, if this agreement is put on the floor this year, I will vote “no,” and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same. Protect working families. Protect the American consumer. Protect our environment. Vote “no” on the TPP.

CONGRESS MUST ACT AFFIRMATIVELY TO PROTECT THE INTERNET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, unless the Congress acts affirmatively by the end of next week, the Obama administration will turn over the core functions of the Internet to an international body. We cannot allow this to happen.

Look at the consequences. Using domain names, we have control over the protection of free speech on the Internet. One of the real positive things of the development of this type of technology over the last 45 or 50 years has been that people have been able to express themselves the way they want to on the Internet and be able to get a huge worldwide audience. Now, I recognize that there is no truth meter on the Internet, but people who make ridiculous statements on the Internet end up getting denigrated in the court of public opinion anyhow.

Free speech is at stake here, but also the national security of our country is at stake. The core functions of the Internet, including control over domain names, should not be turned over to countries that do not have America's best interests or values at heart, like China or Russia or Iran. They have no protections for free speech, they have no value for free speech, and they will do what they want to to put censorship on the Internet, particularly as a way of controlling their own population within their country. If we don't act, that is going to be something that happens, and I think we can guarantee it.

Stopping this move by the Obama administration will also ensure that the

United States Government would maintain ownership and control over the dot-gov and dot-mil domain names. That is necessary to protect our national security.

Just think of what would happen if a hostile power like Iran would be able to get control of both the dot-gov and dot-mil domain names. They would be easier able to hack, they would be easier able to spread around propaganda and disinformation, and unwitting people would think that this is coming from the United States Government. How denigrating will that be? It will be huge, and I think we all know the answer to that.

Now, who is best able to protect a free and open Internet? It is the United States of America, with the protections that we have in our Bill of Rights. Those are protections that have made the Internet grow and flourish.

I tell the administration, if it ain't broke, don't fix it. The Internet ain't broke, but it will become broken if we have countries that do not have our values and stick their nose into the governance of the core functions of the Internet. It is kind of like a termite. You don't see the danger right when the termite starts eating away, but if you allow it to start eating away and don't send the exterminator out, sooner or later there is going to be a big-time problem. Let's keep the termite of hostile powers who don't share our values out of getting into the Internet.

Congress must act affirmatively. We have to stop this from happening, and we don't have much time to do it.

FIND A SOLUTION SO ALL AMERICANS CAN HAVE CONTINUED ACCESS TO AN OPEN AND FREE INTERNET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG) for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, America is a compassionate country. We are a very giving country. America gives a lot. But I am not sure we need to be giving away a free and open Internet.

If Congress does not act soon, our free and open Internet is going to be handed over by our President to a global bureaucratic body, a body that may not respect the freedom of information and speech that we experience today, a body that may sensor what Americans have to say or how journalists can receive information and cover certain stories on governments, on current events.

What does handing the Internet over to a global bureaucracy mean for privacy? for freedom of information? commerce? national security? The question is really: What is the need to do this, to hand over the administration of a working, free, and open Internet to a global bureaucracy? And why the rush?

Now, my colleagues, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) and we